

1 ATKINSON, ANDELSON, LOYA, RUUD & ROMO  
2 A Professional Law Corporation  
3 Brian M. Wheeler State Bar No. 266661  
B.Wheeler@aalrr.com  
4 David Kang State Bar No. 303562  
David.Kang@aalrr.com  
5 12800 Center Court Drive South, Suite 300  
Cerritos, California 90703-9364  
Telephone: (562) 653-3200  
Fax: (562) 653-3333

6  
7 Attorneys for Cross-Defendants  
8 BRIAN J. PARK, ANDREW J. PARK  
and J&K CLOTHING, INC.  
d/b/a LOVE LETTER COLLECTION

9  
10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12 WESTERN DIVISION (LOS ANGELES)

13 HEM & THREAD, INC., a California  
corporation, and HYUN KIM, an  
individual,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 v.

16 WHOLESALEFASHIONSCOM, INC., a California corporation;  
17 DOWNTOWN 11<sup>th</sup>, Inc., a California corporation;  
18 MIN LEE, an individual doing business as ROUSSEAU;  
19 ANDREW LEE, an individual doing business as BOSWELL FASHION; and  
20 DOES 1 through 10,

21 Defendants.

22 WHOLESALEFASHIONSCOM, INC., a California corporation,

23 Crossclaimant

24 v.

25 BRIAN J. PARK, and individual,  
26 ANDREW J. PARK, an individual, J & K  
27 CLOTHING, INC. d/b/a LOVE LETTER  
28 COLLECTION a.k.a. MI AMORE F/S, a  
California Corporation; YOUNG H. CHO,

Case No. 2:19-cv-00283-CBM-AFM

**CROSS-DEFENDANTS  
RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT  
AND CROSS CLAIMANT  
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION  
OF DOCUMENTS (SET ONE)**

Judge: Hon. Consuelo B. Marshall  
Ctrm: 8B

Complaint Filed: January 14, 2019

1 Request to the extent that the particular items and/or categories of documents are not  
2 in the possession, custody or control of Cross-Defendant.

3 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Cross-Defendant  
4 responds as follows: After conducting a reasonable search, Cross-Defendant is not  
5 aware of any document responsive to this Request because to Cross-Defendant's  
6 knowledge, no such documents exist or have ever existed. Cross-Defendant  
7 reserves the right to amend or supplement this response should responsive  
8 documents later be discovered.

9 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:**

10 All Communications and Documents with any party to the action and/or a  
11 third party related to the purchase of the Alleged Infringing Garments.

12 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:**

13 Cross-Defendant Brian J. Park responds as follows:

14 Cross-Defendant objects to this Request on the grounds it is duplicative and is  
15 therefore unduly burdensome and harassing. Cross-Defendant specifically objects  
16 to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks  
17 information that is not relevant, nor proportional to the needs of the case,  
18 considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in  
19 controversy, the parties' relative access to relevant information, the parties'  
20 resources, the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues, and whether the  
21 burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit, or is  
22 otherwise beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Cross-Defendant objects to  
23 this Request on the grounds that it fails to describe with reasonable particularity the  
24 category of documents Crossclaimant seeks to require Cross-Defendant to search  
25 for, to locate, and to make available for inspection and copying. It is not reasonable  
26 to describe documents by categories which bear no relationship to the manner in  
27 which the documents are kept and requires a Cross-Defendant to determine which of  
28 its records fit a demand that essentially seeks every document in Cross-Defendant's

1 possession, custody, or control relating to a topic. Cross-Defendant objects to this  
2 Request on the ground that it is overbroad and exceeds the scope of permitted  
3 discovery in that it seeks to require Cross-Defendant to search for, locate and make  
4 available for inspection and copying documents without limit as to scope and/or  
5 time. Cross-Defendant objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks to require  
6 Cross-Defendant to disclose to Crossclaimant and to its attorney confidential and/or  
7 private information or documents that is protected and/or privileged based on rights  
8 to privacy guaranteed by the United States Constitution and by the California  
9 Constitution. Cross-Defendant objects to this Request to the extent it seeks  
10 information from Cross-Defendant that is protected from disclosure by the attorney-  
11 client privilege and/or by the attorney work-product doctrine. Cross-Defendant  
12 objects to this Request on the ground it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and  
13 harassing under the circumstances and merely intended to vex, harass, and annoy  
14 Cross-Defendant. Cross-Defendant objects to this Request on the ground that it  
15 assumes facts and/or imposes obligations on Cross-Defendant that do not exist.  
16 Cross-Defendant objects to this Request on the ground that it requires Cross-  
17 Defendant to identify and select any document or documents for production based  
18 on a legal interpretation or an expert's opinion. Cross-Defendant objects to this  
19 Request on the ground that it is not full and complete in and of itself and requires  
20 reference to outside materials in order to understand the documents requested. To  
21 the extent that this Request seeks ESI, Cross-Defendant objects on the ground that  
22 ESI is duplicative and the burdens of producing ESI outweigh any potential benefits.  
23 Cross-Defendant objects to this Request to the extent that the particular items and/or  
24 categories of documents are not in the possession, custody or control of Cross-  
25 Defendant.

26 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Cross-Defendant  
27 responds as follows: After conducting a reasonable search, Cross-Defendant is not  
28 aware of any document responsive to this Request because to Cross-Defendant's

1 knowledge, no such documents exist or have ever existed. Cross-Defendant  
2 reserves the right to amend or supplement this response should responsive  
3 documents later be discovered.

4 Cross-Defendant Andrew J. Park responds as follows:

5       Cross-Defendant objects to this Request on the grounds it is duplicative and is  
6 therefore unduly burdensome and harassing. Cross-Defendant specifically objects  
7 to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks  
8 information that is not relevant, nor proportional to the needs of the case,  
9 considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in  
10 controversy, the parties' relative access to relevant information, the parties'  
11 resources, the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues, and whether the  
12 burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit, or is  
13 otherwise beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Cross-Defendant objects to  
14 this Request on the grounds that it fails to describe with reasonable particularity the  
15 category of documents Crossclaimant seeks to require Cross-Defendant to search  
16 for, to locate, and to make available for inspection and copying. It is not reasonable  
17 to describe documents by categories which bear no relationship to the manner in  
18 which the documents are kept and requires a Cross-Defendant to determine which of  
19 its records fit a demand that essentially seeks every document in Cross-Defendant's  
20 possession, custody, or control relating to a topic. Cross-Defendant objects to this  
21 Request on the ground that it is overbroad and exceeds the scope of permitted  
22 discovery in that it seeks to require Cross-Defendant to search for, locate and make  
23 available for inspection and copying documents without limit as to scope and/or  
24 time. Cross-Defendant objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks to require  
25 Cross-Defendant to disclose to Crossclaimant and to its attorney confidential and/or  
26 private information or documents that is protected and/or privileged based on rights  
27 to privacy guaranteed by the United States Constitution and by the California  
28 Constitution. Cross-Defendant objects to this Request to the extent it seeks

1 information from Cross-Defendant that is protected from disclosure by the attorney-  
2 client privilege and/or by the attorney work-product doctrine. Cross-Defendant  
3 objects to this Request on the ground it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and  
4 harassing under the circumstances and merely intended to vex, harass, and annoy  
5 Cross-Defendant. Cross-Defendant objects to this Request on the ground that it  
6 assumes facts and/or imposes obligations on Cross-Defendant that do not exist.  
7 Cross-Defendant objects to this Request on the ground that it requires Cross-  
8 Defendant to identify and select any document or documents for production based  
9 on a legal interpretation or an expert's opinion. Cross-Defendant objects to this  
10 Request on the ground that it is not full and complete in and of itself and requires  
11 reference to outside materials in order to understand the documents requested. To  
12 the extent that this Request seeks ESI, Cross-Defendant objects on the ground that  
13 ESI is duplicative and the burdens of producing ESI outweigh any potential benefits.  
14 Cross-Defendant objects to this Request to the extent that the particular items and/or  
15 categories of documents are not in the possession, custody or control of Cross-  
16 Defendant.

17 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Cross-Defendant  
18 responds as follows: Cross-Defendants will produce non-privileged documents that  
19 are responsive to this request, if any, that are in Cross-Defendants' possession,  
20 custody, or control that Cross-Defendants are able to locate following a reasonable  
21 search.

22 Cross-Defendant J & K Clothing, Inc. responds as follows:

23 Cross-Defendant objects to this Request on the grounds it is duplicative and is  
24 therefore unduly burdensome and harassing. Cross-Defendant specifically objects  
25 to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks  
26 information that is not relevant, nor proportional to the needs of the case,  
27 considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in  
28 controversy, the parties' relative access to relevant information, the parties'

resources, the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues, and whether the burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit, or is otherwise beyond the scope of permissible discovery. Cross-Defendant objects to this Request on the grounds that it fails to describe with reasonable particularity the category of documents Crossclaimant seeks to require Cross-Defendant to search for, to locate, and to make available for inspection and copying. It is not reasonable to describe documents by categories which bear no relationship to the manner in which the documents are kept and requires a Cross-Defendant to determine which of its records fit a demand that essentially seeks every document in Cross-Defendant's possession, custody, or control relating to a topic. Cross-Defendant objects to this Request on the ground that it is overbroad and exceeds the scope of permitted discovery in that it seeks to require Cross-Defendant to search for, locate and make available for inspection and copying documents without limit as to scope and/or time. Cross-Defendant objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks to require Cross-Defendant to disclose to Crossclaimant and to its attorney confidential and/or private information or documents that is protected and/or privileged based on rights to privacy guaranteed by the United States Constitution and by the California Constitution. Cross-Defendant objects to this Request to the extent it seeks information or documents that Cross-Defendant deems proprietary, confidential, trade secret, private, or otherwise protected from disclosure pursuant to California Constitution, Article I, section I, or the California Evidence Code and/or the Federal Rules of Evidence. Cross-Defendant objects to this Request to the extent it seeks information from Cross-Defendant that is protected from disclosure by the attorney-client privilege and/or by the attorney work-product doctrine. Cross-Defendant objects to this Request on the ground it is overbroad, unduly burdensome and harassing under the circumstances and merely intended to vex, harass, and annoy Cross-Defendant. Cross-Defendant objects to this Request on the ground that it assumes facts and/or imposes obligations on Cross-Defendant that do not exist.

1 Cross-Defendant objects to this Request on the ground that it requires Cross-  
2 Defendant to identify and select any document or documents for production based  
3 on a legal interpretation or an expert's opinion. Cross-Defendant objects to this  
4 Request on the ground that it is not full and complete in and of itself and requires  
5 reference to outside materials in order to understand the documents requested. To  
6 the extent that this Request seeks ESI, Cross-Defendant objects on the ground that  
7 ESI is duplicative and the burdens of producing ESI outweigh any potential benefits.  
8 Cross-Defendant objects to this Request to the extent that the particular items and/or  
9 categories of documents are not in the possession, custody or control of Cross-  
10 Defendant.

11 Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Cross-Defendant  
12 responds as follows: Cross-Defendants will produce non-privileged documents that  
13 are responsive to this request, if any, that are in Cross-Defendants' possession,  
14 custody, or control that Cross-Defendants are able to locate following a reasonable  
15 search.

16 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:**

17 All Communications and Documents with any party to the action and/or a  
18 third party related to the sale of the Alleged Infringing Garments.

19 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:**

20 Cross-Defendant Brian J. Park responds as follows:

21 Cross-Defendant objects to this Request on the grounds it is duplicative and is  
22 therefore unduly burdensome and harassing. Cross-Defendant specifically objects  
23 to this Request on the grounds that it is overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks  
24 information that is not relevant, nor proportional to the needs of the case,  
25 considering the importance of the issues at stake in the action, the amount in  
26 controversy, the parties' relative access to relevant information, the parties'  
27 resources, the importance of the discovery in resolving the issues, and whether the  
28 burden or expense of the proposed discovery outweighs its likely benefit, or is